1	2	3	4	5
44	M/s. Roche Products Ltd.	—	Dec., 1982	Dec., 1984-85
45	M/s. Suneeta Laws (P) Limited	April, 1982	April, 1983	April, 1984
46	M/s. Sandoz India Ltd	Dec., 1982	Dec., 1983	Dec., 1984
47	M/s. Tablets Limited	—	April, 1983	April, 1984
48	M/s. Uttar Pradesh Dry pharm	April, 1982	April, 1983	April, 1984
49	M/s. Warner Hindustan Limited	November, 1981	Nov., 1982	Nov., 1983-84
50	M/s. Wyeth Labs. Ltd.	—	Sept., 1982	Sept., 1983 Oct., 1984
51	M/s. Union Dry Co. Ltd.	March, '82	March, 1983	March, 1983
52	M/s. Cavce Pharma (P) Ltd.	June, 1981	July, 82 to Dec., 1983	—
53	M/s. Genu Pharma	March, 1982	March, 1983	March, 1984.
54	M/s. Hoechst Pharma Limited	Dec., 1981	Dec., 1982	Dec., 1983
55	M/s. Burrough Wellcome (I) Ltd.	August, 1982	August, 1983	August, 1984
56	M/s. Glaxo Labs.	—	March, 1982	March, 1983 (incomplete information receipt)

Notices to Drug Companies

2268. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 694 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 29th July, 1985 and state:

(a) the names of the bulk drugs and companies to whom notices were issued who procured drugs at Cheaper prices than the prices at which their formulation prices were fixed;

(b) when it came to the notice of Government and when the notices were issued;

(c) the quantity of each bulk drug procured by each company during the last three years, yearwise alongwith price of procurement and the price at which formulation price was fixed;

(d) the name and the amount of claim worked out in favour of each company and date of intimation;

(e) by when the amount will be collected;

(f) what are the reasons for non-recovery;

(g) whether it is a fact that these companies have been allowed price increases on other medicines in spite of the fact that they are over-charging; and

(h) if so, the name of product and the original and revised price of each?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) Statement showing the names of the company and the bulk drugs in respect of which they have been issued notices for recovery into the Drug Prices Equalisation account under the (Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979 have already been furnished in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1844 for 12-8-1985.

(b) These notices were issued from time to time under Drugs (Prices

Control) Order, 1979 as and when the fact relating to difference between price allowed in the formulations and the actual import/procurement price came to the notice of the Government.

(c) to (f) The process of recovery of the amount due from each company is on in accordance with the due procedure of Law. Before arriving at the amount due, bills etc. relating to purchase are required to be verified. Based on such verification the amounts have been worked out in several cases. One of the formulator which was issued such a notice namely, M/s. Fulford India Ltd. have filed writ Petition in the Delhi High Court. The Delhi High Court has granted an interim stay of proceedings against the company and matter is coming up for consideration of admission of the Writ Petition on 9th September, 1985.

(g) and (h) The question of recovery is not linked with the revision in prices of other bulk drugs and formulations produced by a manufacturer.

Unintended benefit on Drugs

2269. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 624 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 29th July, 1985 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that on an average, Rs. 200 per kg. of unintended benefit was made by each company in the import of Tetracycline;

(b) whether it is also a fact that total unintended benefit of around Rupees five crores was made by formulators on Tetracycline during 1981-82, 1982-83 and 1983-84 which should otherwise have gone to consumer;

(c) what are the reasons for not sending claim notices to all formulators who imported or procured Tetracycline at cheap prices; and why only M/s. Hoechst was served with notice;

(d) who are the major ten formulators of Tetracycline, indicating the name of each and under which pack, strength and price each on is marketing it; and

(e) what was the sales turnover of each of Tetracycline formulations and what was the percentage to total sales turnover of company and profit of each during the last three years, yearwise?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) to (e) Information to the extent available would be collected and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.

Verification of Plant and Machinery of Hoechst

2270. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1231 given in the Rajya Sabha on 13th May, 1985 and state:

(a) when the Technical team visited Hoechst for verification of installation of Plant and Machinery; indicating also the names of the members and whether the report has since been submitted by them;

(b) if so, by when the outcome will be made public;

(c) what was the production of past two years of Baralgan Ketone and the licensed capacity when the company submitted its application for re-endorsement of capacity;

(d) what were the findings of higher achievement of production of the team;

(e) whether the fact of overcharging to the tune of Rs. 20,000 per kg. was considered while allowing re-endorsement of capacity; and

(f) what are the names of other Companies producing Baralgan Ketone and what is their selling price